R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 051 AL 000 679

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE--A SURVEY OF THE PAST DECADE.

BY- MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H.
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40 8P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH (SECOND LANGUAGE), *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *TEACHING PROGRAMS, *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, NON ENGLISH SPEAKING, SURVEYS,

THE AUTHOR HAS TRACED THE RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH TO NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ABROAD. AFTER WORLD WAR II, THE SCOPE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING BECAME "LITERALLY GLOBAL," EMBRACING RAPIDLY DEVELOPING PROGRAMS IN THE FAR AND NEAR EAST, EUROPE, INDIA, AND AFRICA, ALONG WITH EARLIER ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS IN LATIN AMERICA. PARTICULAR MENTION IS MADE OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT BY U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, THE FORD, ROCKEFELLER, ASIA, AND NUFFIELD FOUNDATIONS, THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, AND THE TESOL ORGANIZATION. A DESCRIPTION IS GIVEN OF THE LINGUISTICALLY-ORIENTED TEACHING MATERIALS AND METHODS NOW IN USE, AND THE UNIVERSITY DEGREE PROGRAMS AND TRAINING COURSES FOR TEACHERS BEING OFFERED IN AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS. IN SUMMARY, THE AUTHOR STRESSES THE NEED FOR LONG-TERM PROGRAMS OF MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING, AND CONTINUED RESEARCH ON LANGUAGE, CULTURE, METHODOLOGY, AND LANGUAGE LEARNING. THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN SUPPLEMENT NUMBER 19, OCTOBER 1967, OF "THE LINGUISTIC REPORTER," AND IS AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036. (AM)

The Linguistic Reporter

Supplement Number 19 October 1967

Newsletter of the Center for Applied Linguistics
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

ED014051

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Survey of the Past Decade

by Albert H. Marckwardt

[*Albert H. Marckwardt is Professor of English and Linguistics at Princeton University and currently serves as chairman of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching for the United States Information Agency. The article which follows is a modified version of a report prepared as part of a foundation-supported survey of developments in linguistics over the past decade.*]

Language pedagogy has felt the impact of linguistics in a quite uneven manner. It was first evident, perhaps, in the teaching of English as a foreign language and almost immediately afterward in the teaching of the so-called unusual languages. It was to be more than a decade before the commonly taught foreign languages were at all affected, and longer still before the movement extended to teaching English as a native language.

Albert H. Marckwardt

The reason for this is not at all difficult to determine. It boils down simply to the presence or absence of vested interest and traditional teaching procedures. In 1941, the date of the first classes at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, there were no teaching materials other than those which had been created out of hand the preceding year in preparation for this first group of foreign students to be given an intensive course in English. The very concept of intensive language instruction was new, making it necessary to develop classroom procedures to fit the situation. Within a year or so, as we became involved in the war, the process was destined to be repeated with languages such as Thai, Burmese, Chinese, Japanese, and a host of others, chiefly in connection with the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.

The teaching of English as a foreign language developed in a somewhat parallel fashion on two fronts: adult education projects in Latin America as part of an emergent cultural-relations program designed to counteract previous efforts on the part of the German and Italian governments; intensive courses in American colleges and universities to enable visiting scholars and advanced students, also chiefly from Latin America, to pursue advanced studies in this country—not necessarily at the institution where they received their English training.

Our earliest attempts to teach English in Latin America demonstrated clearly that the popular interest in English instruction was potentially so great that demand would soon outrun any conceivable supply of teachers. Within months after their opening, centers in Mexico City, Caracas, and Bogotá had enrollments ranging from one to three thousand. In order to meet the situation, teacher-training programs developed both in the United States and within the countries where English-teaching activities had been established. The latter were—as they still are—chiefly in-service, directed toward the native secondary-school teachers. The former were in part pre-service, aimed at building up a corps of qualified personnel for new positions, both at home and abroad.

With the end of the war, Latin America ceased to be the sole focus of our English-teaching efforts. Our activities became literally global in their scope, embracing the Far East, the Near East, and portions of Europe. Japan, where literary studies in English had been highly developed up to 1940, proceeded under American prodding to change its educational system and made English, to all intents and purposes, a required subject in a curriculum which called for universal education through the ninth grade. This alone demanded initial training or retraining of some fifty thousand teachers of English. The countries of Southeast Asia, both the old and the emergent, felt a need for English beyond anything that

AL 000 679

had previously existed. The United States and Great Britain both responded to the situation, sometimes working as rivals, sometimes with a reasonable degree of cooperation, but rarely going about the business in quite the same fashion.

The story in the Near East was much the same, although the need for English arose more often as a consequence of our technical assistance programs than from a vast expansion of the educational systems. Many European countries were already teaching foreign languages far more effectively than the United States, and consequently there was little need for our assistance except for the development of American Studies at the university level. Even so, Italy and Greece, and to a somewhat lesser degree Austria, have received both American and English assistance and continue to do so. Recently the eastern European countries have indicated an interest in further development of their English-teaching programs and a willingness to accept at least a degree of American aid.

During the past decade the political changes and the development of new nations in Africa have created a new demand, both for direct teaching and for teacher-training, again on a vast scale. In fact, two kinds of demands have developed: the teaching of English to non-English-speaking natives in countries where English is either officially or unofficially the language of government, business, and education, and the teaching of English in francophone Africa. There has been great concern as well over the state of English in India, Pakistan, and Ceylon where, because of changes in government and language rivalries, the command of the language has retrogressed at the same time that it has become more essential as a cementing force and a channel of communication, a situation which has had a paler and less critical reflection in the Philippine Islands.

Thus far in this report, English-teaching activities have been ascribed merely to the United States and Great Britain as countries, but of course they are carried on by agencies within the countries. The British situation is relatively simple: the British Council is responsible for almost all of the activity except for instruction by radio and television, which comes under the aegis of the British Broadcasting Corporation. In general the two agencies cooperate closely and harmoniously.

English-teaching activities by the United States government present a quite different picture. No less than seven government agencies are involved in one way or another: the Department of State, through the Fulbright program; the Agency for International Development; the U.S. Office of Education, through the International Teacher Exchange Program; the Department of Defense; the Peace Corps; and the Department of the Interior, which has the responsibility for English instruction in the Indian schools in this country and the Trust Territories overseas.

Support for English teaching has by no means been limited to the federal government. The foundations have played a significant role in a number of countries. The Ford Foundation has "supported basic communication and linguistics research; the expansion of knowledge and scholars, and the increase of training-tools and teacher-trainers in the United States in relation to both modern and the so-called unfamiliar foreign languages, and to English as a second language; development in some thirteen countries of training facilities for English as a second language; experimentation with new approaches to language learning in the schools, improvement of links and interchange between scholars and teachers in the United States and in other countries" (personal letter from Melvin J. Fox, Associate Director, International Training and Research Program of the Ford Foundation). The thirteen countries referred to in the foregoing statement are Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Nigeria, Peru, Pakistan, Spain, Syria, Tunisia, and Turkey. The Rockefeller Foundation, though operating on a smaller scale and with less overall coordination of its total international activity, has nevertheless given support to a major project in the Philippines, to one in the United Arab Republic, to various countries in Latin America, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has financed work in Japan. Limited support for work in Southeast Asia has come from the Asia Foundation. In Britain the Nuffield Foundation has been interested in the development of textbook materials for use in Africa, and for a time at least was supporting a research project based at Makerere College in Uganda.

In the light of this very broad presentation of the teaching of English as a foreign language, intended to serve primarily as a background, it will be helpful next to survey in somewhat greater detail the situation as it was approximately a decade ago, so that a description of where we are today will appear in sharper focus and also that developments for the future may be projected.

THE SITUATION A DECADE AGO

In 1957, country activities were already widespread, wider in fact than the supply of well-trained manpower could possibly satisfy. Africa, Spain, and eastern Europe were not yet in the picture, it is true, but they have served merely to put an additional strain on an already overburdened professional effort. In this country a fair number of colleges and universities were offering special instruction in English for foreign students, but they were for the most part the larger institutions. Places such as the University of Texas, Michigan, California at Los Angeles, Indiana, Illinois, and Columbia had well-developed programs, many of them going back to the immediate post-war period. There were, however, probably not more than fifty, if indeed they numbered that many.

Government support of English-teaching activities was chaotic, to say the least. The various agencies involved had not yet formulated clear ideas of their function, and in some instances budgetary appropriations were grossly insufficient for the programs that were being conceived. The United States Information Agency will serve as a typical illustration. At this time it had merely Branch status. It was housed in three crowed basement rooms. It was greatly understaffed. It had no effective means of presenting its case for increased support and clarification of function to any of the citizen advisory committees upon which the Agency depended for guidance. The normal promotional steps within the Agency provided no opportunity for anyone to make a career of English teaching—the higher anyone rose in rank, the less his connection with it. Early attempts at inter-agency cooperation had foundered, and there was little communication, to say nothing of coordination, among the various government departments engaged in English teaching.

Even so, there were one or two bright spots on the horizon. The Fulbright steering committee for Linguistics and English Language Teaching had that fall passed a resolution calling for the crea-

tion of an extra-governmental body or organization which might provide a channel of communication between the government and the universities, as well as among the various agencies of the government, with respect to English teaching and other activities involving the application of linguistics. This was the first in a chain of events which led to the establishment of the Center for Applied Linguistics. At the same time, the Advisory Committee for Cultural Information of the United States Information Agency created a small sub-committee to report to it on the activities of the English Teaching Branch of the agency. This too was an initial step, leading ultimately to the establishment of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching, which now reports directly to the Director of the Agency.

Teaching materials, though a great improvement over what had been available previously, were still in a somewhat rudimentary stage. Certain principles and techniques had, however, been established. The use of a contrastive analysis of native and target languages was one of these. The University of Michigan materials in their earliest phase were firmly based upon an English–Spanish contrast. This was still implicit in the four revised volumes which appeared in 1958, which by that time were serving native speakers of a host of different languages.

The same contrastive principle lay behind the nine volumes produced by the American Council of Learned Societies between 1952 and 1956, under contract with the State Department. Although the so-called *General Form*, designed as a basic pattern for the entire series, had been produced in advance of the textbooks themselves by William Welmers, working at Cornell University, each of the specific volumes, designed for native speakers of Burmese, Greek, Indonesian, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Persian, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, and Turkish (and one for Spanish speakers published commercially) took the structural differences between English and the native language into account. It must be conceded, however, that the contrastive studies upon which all of these materials were said to have been based were never published, and as far as can be determined, they consisted of somewhat unorganized material reposing in file drawers in Ithaca, Washington, Ann Arbor, and elsewhere.

Both the Michigan and ACLS materials aimed primarily at a spoken command of English, and in order to achieve this, they devoted considerable attention to stress and intonation. At this point, the similarity between them ceases. The ACLS authors adhered religiously to the Trager-Smith phonology and employed a Tragerian phonemic notation, often to the complete mystification of the teachers who tried to use the series. Kenneth Pike had had a considerable influence on this aspect of the Michigan approach, and the presentation of the phonology there was possibly less rigorous but also less forbidding. Even the numbers indicating pitch levels ran in opposite directions in the two sets. Nevertheless, they agreed in promoting accuracy rather than fluency as an initial goal.

Another similarity in the two textbook series was to be seen in their departure from the pure mim-mem technique characteristic of the wartime language manuals. The emphasis was upon pattern drill, mastered to the point where automatic or instantaneous recall would occur. A statement by Robert Lado in the Introduction to *English Pattern Practices*, 1958 (the fourth volume of the revised Michigan series) is the most cogent explanation of the pedagogical strategy which lay behind the procedure:

> In Pattern Practice . . . the student is led to practice a pattern, changing some element of the pattern each time, so that normally he never repeats the same sentence twice. Furthermore, his attention is drawn to changes, which are stimulated by pictures, oral substitutions, etc., and this, THE PATTERN ITSELF, THE SIGNIFICANT FRAMEWORK OF THE SENTENCE, rather than the particular sentence, is driven intensively into his habit reflexes.

A concomitant of the careful attention to grammatical structure exemplified by these textbooks was a management of vocabulary items quite different from that typical of the conventional language textbook. The vocabulary was controlled, but no longer on the basis of frequency counts, since most of these had turned out to be biased in one direction or another. The idea was rather to enable the student to manage a fair number of grammatical patterns with a somewhat limited but nevertheless useful vocabulary, building up the lexicon after control of the basic structures had been achieved. This was justified on the ground that the native language is generally learned in this fashion.

Most of the materials available at this time were modest in their aims; they were not directed beyond an intermediate level of achievement. There was virtually nothing for advanced students, nothing designed to train students initially taught by an audio-lingual method to cope with literary English, nothing designed to teach the student how to write acceptable English themes. The profession was decidedly in a first phase of materials production.

Both the Michigan and the ACLS materials were designed primarily to serve prospective students and research fellows in American institutions of higher learning. In both instances the content, the lexicon, the exercises, the drill materials were chosen for their utility in a campus setting. To this extent they did try to bridge a cultural as well as a linguistic gap, but they were fairly naive in their attempts to do so. In neither instance had the authors learned how flat the humor in language textbooks usually seems, nor were they able to raise the level of it. Although the Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture, sponsored by the Modern Language Association of America, had been held in the summer of 1953 and had indeed proposed the desirability of cultural as well as linguistic contrastive studies as a preliminary assessment of the extent of a foreign language teaching problem, there was no evidence that the suggestion had been heeded. Nevertheless, despite these shortcomings, the approach in the textbooks was comparatively new, there was an air of freshness about it, and teachers properly trained to use the textbooks achieved striking results at times.

The training of teachers did, however, present a serious problem both in this country and abroad. In the United States not every institution which provided English instruction for foreign students had the resources to develop a teacher-training program. Nor was there yet a clear notion of what the content of such a program ought to be, although certain principles of organization were beginning to emerge. For the most part, what training did exist was on the M.A. level, centered about a core of linguistic courses. Whatever was offered in addition to this core varied widely at the dozen or so institutions where TEFL training was available.

Outside of this country, only Europe could boast of a long tradition of profes-

sional language instruction. The western European countries, never under the frantic time pressure that characterized foreign-language instruction in the United States, were generally satisfied with their own more deliberate methods and seemed little inclined to join us in an exploration of the possibilities of applying new linguistic concepts. To many of them, these seemed as objectionably American as the variety of English spoken in the United States. The British, always somewhat suspicious of direct vocational preparation, were often content to assign the teaching of English as a foreign language to someone who had specialized in geography or the classical languages in his university career. There were nascent teacher-preparation programs at the universities of London and Edinburgh, but because chairs in the subject had not been provided, it belonged to the academic demi-monde, carried on usually in the guise of institutes.

Elsewhere throughout the world, short-term seminars or workshops, conducted by Americans or British, or occasionally by both operating in various degrees of cooperation or rivalry, were the principal resource for the upgrading of teachers in service, and somewhat less often for pre-service preparation. There was little continuity from year to year. Seldom did American or British assistance proceed in any one country upon the basis of a careful examination of the foreign-language teaching situation in the country. My own analysis of the English-teaching situation in Italy in 1954, made far too hurriedly with insufficient assistance and no opportunity for class visitation, was not repeated elsewhere until much later.

An additional word must be said at this point about teaching aids of various kinds, chiefly the language laboratory and radio. Language instruction by radio had developed in the early 1940's, not long after the initial attempts in this country, and a good many of the American binational centers had attempted to employ the medium. In general materials were locally produced, often frantically just ahead of broadcast time. There was no communication among the various countries relative to the principles to be employed in developing materials, to various ways in which programs might be conducted, or to methods of evaluation. Responsibility for such program often rested with the Information Officers rather than the English Teaching Branch of the U.S. Information Agency, and at that time there was little language-teaching expertise among the former.

Although a certain degree of sophistication was beginning to develop in various models for laboratory teaching and reinforcement of teaching of the foreign languages in the United States, English-teaching materials had not progressed beyond the stage of discs accompanying the textbooks. Even these at times failed of their purpose; it turned out, for example, that every available record player in Burma operated at 78 rpm, whereas the ACLS *English for Burmese* had been recorded at 33. True enough, this is an extreme illustration, but it is symptomatic of how little thought had been given to the problem of audio-aids.

A final aspect of instruction in English as a foreign language a decade ago which need be mentioned only briefly is testing. It is superfluous to dwell upon the importance of measures of language potential and language achievement. Huge sums can be wasted in bringing inadequately prepared students to an academic environment which demands of them a working knowledge of English. There can be an equal waste in insisting that students undertake classwork in English which repeats what they already know. The need for measuring instruments was just beginning to be met by tests developed at the University of Michigan and at the American Language Center, then at American University in Washington, D.C. One of the major problems was an adequate measure of oral competence. Valiant attempts were under way to measure this through paper-and-pencil techniques, but the results were not of such a nature as to inspire a considerable degree of confidence. As in so many other aspects of the instructional problem, a bare start had just been made.

THE SITUATION TODAY

It is doubtful that any single individual has sufficient competence and experience to assess the entire English-teaching situation as of the current year. The expansion has been inordinately great; changes have come rapidly during the past decade. To begin with, we are teaching more students both at home and abroad. The most recent report issued by the Center for Applied Linguistics (1967) shows that 150 colleges and universities in this country now offer English courses for foreign students. Of these, approximately forty institutions offer what might justifiably be called an intensive course of courses, some of them demanding as much as 35 hours weekly, although 20–25 is closer to the norm.

The clearest idea of the scope of our activities abroad can be gained from the annual report of the U.S. Information Agency. During the fiscal year 1966, the Agency conducted English-teaching programs in 57 countries, with a total enrollment of 309,857. This teaching was largely to adults, reaching such groups as government officials, teachers, university and secondary-school students, military and labor leaders. In many countries without institutionalized programs, *ad hoc* English classes were conducted on an informal basis, and the students were not included in the foregoing total.

The 57 countries include 19 in Latin America, 16 in Africa, and 12 in the Near East. Some of the individual country operations are fantastic in size, the 38 centers in Brazil enrolling 53,817 students. Four centers in Iran have 12,878 students, and a single one in Thailand has 11,526. Even though activity in Europe has been severely curtailed and that in the Far East may be best described as selective, there are no indications of a diminution in demand. All signs point to continued growth, not only in this but in the six government agencies as well.

It is pleasant to be able to say that the government situation is less chaotic than it was a decade ago. Primary responsibility for the coordination of English-teaching activities has been placed in the Bureau of Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. An inter-agency committee on English teaching is operating with greater effectiveness than it ever has before. Attempts are under way to have field teams evaluate the total English-teaching program in certain countries.

Communication and cooperation within USIA have also improved, partly perhaps as a consequence of the recommendations of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching, a group consisting of six linguists drawn from university faculties. The Voice of America has had a highly competent English-teaching specialist in its radio division for the past five years, and has had staff members from the English Teaching Division on loan to assist in the development of televised materials. English teaching now

has Division instead of Branch status within the Agency, which has meant an upgrading of the persons in charge of the activity. The staff is five times as large as it was in 1957, and the quarters are much more nearly adequate. The position of English Teaching Officer has been created, which makes possible a longer period of specialization in English-teaching activities. Similar improvements, though possibly not so extensive or dramatic, have taken place in other government agencies.

Communication between government and the profession has been markedly improved as a result of the organization of the National Advisory Council on Teaching English as a Foreign Language, under the sponsorship of the Center for Applied Linguistics. A semi-annual meeting gives government personnel the opportunity to report on programs current and projected and to outline their needs. University representatives react to these, report on their activities, and out of the frank and open discussion which ensues, new ideas frequently emerge.

Conferences, both national and international, have been fruitful in providing for exchange of information and opinion. Two national conferences on teaching English as a foreign language, held in the early 1940's, were followed by a long silence, and it was not until July 1957, that a third was convened at the University of Michigan with funds provided by the Ford Foundation. Its principal purpose was to bring together two main groups: "the theoretical iinguists on the one hand, and all those whose interests were practical and pedagogical on the other." This was followed two years later by a Conference on English Teaching Abroad held in Washington, D.C. It included representatives from the British Council as well as from a number of American agencies and was one of the first undertakings of the Center for Applied Linguistics. Soon after this the Center began its annual series of International Conferences on Second Language Teaching, with not merely Americans and British but other nationalities in attendance as well. The French in particular have made notable contributions to these.

If any criticism at all can be levelled at such activities, it is that they serve chiefly to inform and to broaden the insights of those currently in attendance. The reporting of some of them has been spotty and restricted in circulation. I believe it is a mistake to assume that a past member of NACTEFL is no longer interested in what goes on at the meetings of the National Advisory Council. Certainly he does not want to read all the reports and position papers, in detail, but I am certain that he would welcome a brief but cogently written digest of the discussions. This would be one way of insuring an ever-widening circle of professionals.

At all events, the last ten years have seen a vast improvement in the amount of information readily available on teaching English as a foreign language. There have been a number of bibliographies, the principal one being the *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language*, published by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The Center has published a number of other more specialized bibliographies as well, and the British Council has been producing its own *English-Teaching Bibliography*. It is not necessary to enumerate or describe these here; the point is that bibliographical information is readily available now whereas ten years ago there was but a single publication.

Communication within the profession has also been facilitated by the development of a number of new journals. In 1957 virtually the only outlet in this country for an article on some aspect of TEFL was *Language Learning*, which began at the University of Michigan in 1948 as a project of the Language Learning Research Club. Such existing journals as *Language, College English*, or *American Speech* would occasionally accept a contribution on the subject as a favor to the author, but it was clearly beyond their scope and normal range of interest. True enough, *English Language Teaching*, an English quarterly, had been in existence since 1945, but it reflected chiefly British theory and practice.

During the past decade, the U.S. Information Agency has established the *English Teaching Forum*, the *International Review of Applied Linguistics* has appeared on the scene, and the newly formed TESOL Association has recently begun publication of its journal, *TESOL Quarterly*. In addition, a number of journals devoted to English-teaching problems in particular countries have sprung up: The *ELEC Bulletin* for Japan, *INTERPRET* for the Puerto-Rican teacher, the *Bulletin of the Central Institute of English*, published in Hyderabad, India, and two from the Philippines. Furthermore, certain other countries, Czechoslovakia and Chile to name only two, now have publications dealing with the teaching of modern languages in general, and many of their articles deal with English. There are finally, two periodical publications of research abstracts, one in England and one in this country. It is unnecessary to cite any more titles; everything points to the important conclusion that information of all kinds on the teaching of English as a second language is available on a vastly wider scale than it was ten years ago. The difficulty now is keeping up with everything that appears. It is true that quality as well as quantity must be considered. In this connection it may be justly said that the level of sound knowledge and intellectual sophistication represented in these journals is neither higher nor lower than it is in other divisions of the field of language pedagogy.

With respect to English-teaching materials the story is much the same. The last ten years have shown a tremendous increase in every direction. First of all, the instructional range has increased. Materials on a fairly advanced level are currently available, and some of them are designed to aid the student in developing the level of writing skill which might be demanded of him in a freshman English course in an American college or university. Many of the collections of readings recently published reveal a recognition on the part of the editors that the student needs an introduction to the principal facets of American culture considerably more profound than the campus dialogues about dating practices, which abound in the ACLS series.

No longer are we wholly dependent upon the ACLS and Michigan series for domestic use. English Language Services, the American Language Centers at Georgetown, at Columbia, and at New York University have all produced their own sets of materials, adapted to the particular conditions which prevail at those institutions. The English Language Services material has been programmed and is available from a commercial publisher. Moreover, there are textbooks designed for specific purposes, such as Kenneth Croft's *A Practice Book on English Stress and Intonation*, C. L. Glover's exercises designed to extend the student's vocabulary, and Thomas Crowell's glossary of phrases with prepositions, all of which can be used as auxiliaries to a general textbook. In the most recent bibliography,

a listing of general text materials alone occupies 35 pages.

Moreover, linguistically oriented teaching materials have begun to appear in a number of foreign countries, many of them produced by Americans or by natives with American training. Instances of this are Agard and Roberts' *L'inglese parlato* for Italians: two sets of ELEC materials in Japan, one for adults, the other for junior high schools; a nine volume series in Mexico, published by the Instituto Mexicano Norteamericano de Relaciones Culturales; the six volume *English Through Practice* by Lydia Miquel and Augusto Manriquez, for use in the Chilean schools; the series prepared for use in the Filipino elementary schools by the Philippine Center for Language Study; and the *Spoken English for Turks* by Wise, Downing, and Jaekel, a thoroughgoing revision of the original ACLS volume. These are only a few of the most notable. A listing of what is currently known to be available occupies more than 80 pages in the current CAL bibliography.

In this connection it must be pointed out as well that the contrastive studies upon which such materials are based have likewise multiplied in the past decade. Important among these is the series prepared by the Center for Applied Linguistics under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education and published by the University of Chicago Press. The first to appear were *The Sounds of English and German* by William G. Moulton and *The Grammatical Structures of English and German* by Herbert L. Kufner. Similar volumes for Spanish and Italian are available now; those for Russian and French will appear shortly. In addition to these, there are studies of smaller scope embracing such languages as Indonesian, Telegu, Cebuano, Japanese, Finnish, Iraqi Arabic, and Turkish, to name only a few. And again, through the CAL publication, *A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics*, bibliographical information is now available where there was none before.

One series which merits particular mention because it illustrates the kind of cooperative effort which can be successfully launched when there is the will to do so is *English For Today*, a set of six volumes designed for use abroad at a level that would correspond to the American junior and senior high school. It was produced by the National Council of Teachers of English under contract with the United States Information Agency. It is a general purpose text, not designed to meet the specific learning problems of the speakers of any particular language. Nevertheless, according to the terms of the publishing agreement with McGraw-Hill, the way is left open for adaptations to be made, to fit the needs of any particular country. At present, French and Arabic adaptations are under way, and two others, for Slovenia and Nigeria, are being negotiated. One interesting feature of the series is the sixth volume, an anthology of literature *in* English, which includes selections from Australian, Canadian, Irish, and Indian authors as well as from English and American. The British Council has praised this feature of the volume lavishly.

Certainly the materials today represent a great advance over what was available a decade ago. The gap between what is needed and what is at hand is closing rapidly. As time goes on, there are fewer instances of ill-digested linguistics. It is admittedly true that the Peruvian or the American in Peru setting out to develop a series of textbooks does not take advantage of all the experience that has accrued in Japan, Italy, the Philippines and elsewhere, but at least he does not have to work totally in the dark, and generally he does not. What is needed today, if anything, is evaluation of what we have, in order to discover the approaches and devices which are effective and those which are not, that we may make the wisest use of our successes and our failures. This, indeed, is asking for more than we have achieved with respect to American textbooks generally, and it is only because so many of these projects have been genuinely cooperative that such a possibility can even be mentioned.

There has been considerable development of audio-visual aids, especially in films and television, though again evaluation is a difficult matter. Again, using the U.S. Information Agency as a sample, we find three English-by-television series, offering a total of 260 quarter-hour lessons: *Let's Learn English*, *Let's Speak English*, and *Adventures in English*. Accompanying each of the 260 programs is a teacher's script designed to help local television stations present supporting practice sessions immediately following the showing of the films. In radio the Agency has completed eight series designed for use by intermediate and advanced students. These include *Time and Tune in English*, a series of 25 quarter-hour lessons on American English stress, rhythm, and intonation; *Review Your English*, a 39-lesson series; *Improve Your English*, also 39 lessons, these devoted to verb structures and practice on conversational speech patterns. BBC probably has as much as this, if not more, and Australia has developed materials for teaching by radio as well.

A number of problems have arisen in connection with the development of radio and television materials. A major one is proper control of intonation. Another is securing the proper person to give the lessons. If he is an actor or a radio professional, his diction is likely to smack of the stage; if he is a linguist or a teacher, his performance stands a good chance of being dull.

The story with respect to language laboratories is less encouraging. Here the virtuosity of the electronic technician has outrun the ingenuity of the language teacher. Tape has replaced the earlier discs; dialing systems are the latest dazzling attraction. Unfortunately a clear line has never been drawn between the potential of the laboratory as a means of reinforcing instruction given through conventional methods and the laboratory as a means of expanding the instructional program or even as a self-teaching device. The latter require different types of materials, and too often the distinction has not been made. Moreover, we have frequently proceeded upon two mistaken assumptions, first that the student will generally be able to recognize a difference between the language of the model on the tape and his attempt to reproduce it, and second, that if he does recognize the difference, he will know what to do about it. Actual experience has shown that this is often not the case. Moreover, we know very little about laboratory monitoring: those procedures which are productive of good results, and those which constitute little more than interruption and annoyance. This constitutes a whole area of sorely needed research.

Both at home and abroad the laboratory is regarded as a status symbol, or else it is seen as a promise of vastly increased instructional efficiency. Both attitudes are less than helpful: the first is likely to result in the machines' gathering dust, the second in disappointment. For the present we can only emphasize the necessity of a clear concept of statement of the uses to which a laboratory is to be put if it is installed. We must insist that materials for it be specifically designed or

adapted, and that teachers be given instruction in its use.

English testing entered its current phase with a Conference on Testing the English Proficiency of Foreign Students, held in Washington in May 1961. This group went on record "as recognizing the desirability of, and urgent need for a comprehensive program using carefully constructed tests of the English proficiency of foreign students, suitable and acceptable to all educational institutions in the United States and to various other organizations, chiefly governmental." As a consequence of this decision, a second conference was called in January 1962, at which a National Council on the Testing of English as a Foreign Language was established. In April 1963, the Ford Foundation announced a two-year $250,000 grant to assist the Council in initiating the testing program it had proposed. The work went on under the direction of Dr. David P. Harris, and the first TOEFL proficiency tests were administered in February 1964. Again this is an exemplary instance of coordinated effort involving some thirty member organizations and made possible through the assistance of a foundation. It is still somewhat early to venture a prediction about the success of the program, but since from its very beginning it was planned and shaped by foreign-student advisers and teachers, admissions officers, student exchange specialists, and government officials—the very groups with a stake in its success—it is reasonable to assume that the tests will be widely used.

In view of the tremendous expansion of activity on virtually every front during the past decade, the personnel problem looms large. The supply of trained teachers of English as a foreign language, supervisors, and program planners has been far short of the demand, both here and abroad. In Poland, for example, English is still in third place among foreign languages elected in the secondary schools simply because not enough teachers are being turned out by the universities. With the projected lengthening of the period of compulsory education in Thailand, it will be but a matter of a few years before a critical shortage develops there. The multiplication of secondary schools in Africa is bound to produce the same result.

At home every government agency involved in teaching English has positions to be filled. The mail is replete with requests from colleges and universities for persons who can teach or administer a program in English as a foreign language. The most recent survey of training facilities at American institutions of higher learning shows but a single university (New York) offering an A.B. degree in TEFL and possibly six others offering a degree in a field in which TEFL may be elected as a major or minor specialty. We are strongest at the M.A. level with ten institutions providing an M.A. in TEFL and nine others offering a program in a field where work in TEFL is permitted. At some six or seven a student may earn a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. in the field. This represents a considerable expansion over the past ten years, due in no small part to assistance provided through NDEA. In-service training in this country has also benefited by a recent interpretation of the NDEA enabling legislation to the effect that TEFL Institutes may qualify for support as long as they serve American teachers of English as a foreign language who teach in American schools. Although at first glance this may seem restrictive, the teaching of English in urban areas, in parts of the country where there is a large foreign-language speaking population, and on the Indian reservations has been greatly aided.

It is very likely that if all the institutions offering work in TEFL training operated at full capacity, they could produce the needed personnel. A major problem is that of convincing students that TEFL offers a promising and rewarding academic career. Returned Peace Corps Volunteers would provide a prime source of manpower if they could be supported in graduate school.

TEFL training of foreign teachers represents a problem of a different nature. In some countries, such as Japan, with some 60,000 teachers of English in the secondary schools alone, we seem tc be confronted with an impossible task. Here the only solution appears to be to train those who train the teachers, or even those who train the teacher-trainers. India presents a comparable situation. Elsewhere, let us say in the small Latin American countries, or in an Eastern European country such as Bulgaria, a series of well-planned in-service courses could reach almost the entire teacher corps in a space of five or six years. It boils down virtually to having a TEFL plan for every country, based upon an accurate assessment of the English-teaching situation there.

Only a brief word need be said about books and materials on pedagogy and methodology currently available. These, too, have multiplied enormously in the past decade. There is a good assortment of books in the field, by British as well as Americans, appealing both to special and to general interests. The anthology by Harold B. Allen of essays and research articles on teaching English as a foreign language provides a valuable supplement. No longer need the instructor in a methods course be reduced to lecturing for want of a proper textbook.

CURRENT NEEDS

We come finally to the question of what needs to be done, and more specifically to the question of what organizations outside of the government can and should do. The government is already pouring millions annually into English teaching, and if the heads of the various executive branches are to be believed, the amount will increase.

The role of other agencies, therefore, would seem to lie in those areas where there are gaps in government support. The problem is to identify the particular areas where, in the past at least, the government has failed for one reason or another to operate effectively. First of all, there is a political and geographic side to the problem. Official action can achieve but very little in most of the Communist-controlled world and in some neutralist areas. Consequently, in a country such as Czechoslovakia, with its elaborate organization of research institutes, there would seem to be real possibilities for fruitful collaboration among scholars on a non-official basis, but relatively little can be done under government auspices.

The other notable gap in governmental support arises from the short-term nature of so many of its projects. For example, the Southeast Asia Regional English Project, designed to upgrade the teaching of English in Thailand, Vietnam, and Laos, through an AID contract with the University of Michigan, was forced to close out just at the time that a real impact was becoming apparent. A series of textbooks for teacher candidates had been prepared, and precisely at the point when they might have been used to good effect, the corps of trained personnel who could have used them in the training schools was withdrawn. The Columbia program in Afghanistan, though proceeding from

a somewhat less auspicious base, stands out in striking contrast in terms of total achievement, as does the UCLA Program in the Philippines. There is every reason to heed the educational truism which holds that it takes at least twenty-five years to put an educational change into operation.

The suggested approach of filling in the gaps could be applied to research activities as well. We need desperately a series of studies which will indicate clearly the status of English teaching in virtually all of the fifty-seven countries in which there are ongoing programs, and possibly many others as well. The place of English is by no means the same in the educational systems of Thailand and Japan, nor will English serve these countries in precisely the same way.

When I first came to Poland in 1965, I was told by almost everyone I encountered that English was the most popular foreign language in the secondary schools, and that about 80 percent of the students were electing it. The facts turned out to be dramatically different. Elections in English were fewer than those in both Latin and German, and indeed only 26 percent of the students were receiving English instruction. We have available just one detailed study of the kind that is needed, John A. Brownell's *Japan's Second Language*, a Phi Delta Kappa International Education Monograph, and we are indebted to the National Council of Teachers of English for having published it. My own analyses of the English-teaching situations in Italy, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Poland have been hastily conducted; nevertheless, what they report is attested fact, and I have been told that they have proved useful. They were hastily put together, on a schedule which allowed about three weeks to a country. I am convinced that eight weeks would suffice for a reasonably accurate picture. In general these studies are difficult to support with government funds unless there is a reasonable possibility of government activity in the countries concerned. Harold Allen's *Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-native English Speakers in the United States* is a pilot attempt at a domestic survey which we also owe to the National Council of Teachers of English, and his suggestions for possible further study should be heeded.

It is impossible to do sufficient justice to the tremendous impact of the Center for Applied Linguistics over the past seven or eight years. The amount of information the Center has made available, relative to virtually every aspect of TEFL, has been of incalculable assistance. TEFL is an uncoordinated operation at best, but without the Center it would have been utter confusion. Moreover, every single one of the Center services is of such vital importance that it must be continued in one way or another. Possibly the ERIC operation will provide government funds for one or two aspects of its work which must now be taken out of its own resources, but it will not solve the entire problem.

In short, the current needs have not altered materially since the Center published its pamphlet *English Overseas* in 1961, appropriately subtitled "Guidelines for the American Effort in Teaching English as a Second Language." English cannot assume its inevitable position as a world language without material and professional assistance of the first magnitude. Particularly important in this pamphlet is the final section on research, which calls for linguistic and area research, the development of measures of effectiveness of various kinds of instructional materials, the evaluation of current methods of language instruction, and basic work on the psychology of language learning. Research in all of these fields is in need of support.

To sum up, fact-finding studies of the status of English instruction, strategically placed long-term programs of materials development and teacher training, and continued research on language and culture, methodology, and language learning will make a significant contribution to the wider use of English throughout the world.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

4-17-68